Minutes for Workgroup #174 – Informed Delivery APP

Session 17: 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m. EST WebEx

Jody opened up the meeting and focused discussion on the PostalOne! integration topic. Ryan Luckay, USPS, talked about the current process, during the pilot, as 'manual'. Extracts of Mail.XML or Mail.dat can be forwarded to the Informed Delivery Team for human execution until an API is designed, developed and implemented. He offered a brief explanation of the workflow diagrammed in the presentation.

Mailers currently upload the Mail.dat or Mail.xml files to the USPS PostalOne! In anticipation of the Informed Delivery Pilot, the Mail.dat has been modified to include two new fields one intended for a hyperlink to the interactive content, the other is intended to capture an image. The image format (PDF, JPG) is still under discussion. Another consideration would be to post the image to a website and have the field populated with an indicator for the image location.

The group could benefit with a little further discussion on the data elements that need to be extracted from the Mail.dat versus the Mailing Planning information required to prepare for the mailings in advance and the timing of the information flow.

When the question came up about how the Postal Service would know if the Mailer was participating in the program, would they use the fact that the two new fields in Mail.dat or Mail.xml as a trigger? Phil asked about the Opt-Out vs. Opt-In approach. Jody explained that the pilot is operating on the parameters the Postal Service defined and the workgroup recommendations would be considered for the next generation of Informed Delivery service.

Wendy asked if we had not discussed using the STIDs as a trigger. Jody flipped to the summary of the deck to confirm we had captured that recommendation.

Tracy noted a couple of coordination issues with submitting the URL/hyperlink and what happens if the link doesn't match the job. Raising the question about the QC process that ought to be put in place to ensure the correct images are included. Ryan suggested the workgroup develop and submit a user story to support QC development.

We learned the unique MID requirement for Pilot participation is, in some cases, affecting the seamless program and related reporting. In cases where a Mailer can use their current MID for testing or where they can incorporate new test MIDs, this isn't an issue. Wendy stated that triggering the usage by sequence/serial numbers within the IMb, so Pilot participants don't lose tracking information and ACS transactions, would be in the May release. Ryan indicated he was not familiar with the exact specifications for the May release and said the team was still discussing the scope.

When asked what APIs would be set up for business customers/Mailers, Ryan mentioned a multi-directional API.

Wendy pointed out that there are still challenges in the commingle/presort bureau workflow. Jody reminded the group that, last meeting, Steve Krejick had raised this concern in relation to the subgroup

recommendation document. Action item: To schedule a call with the Presort representatives to talk through the issues.

Lisa Bowes recommended that we reach out to Bob Schimek, Mail.dat Editor & request time to further discuss. Lisa also recommended a discussion occur amongst the Informed Delivery workgroup leaders and the Postal Service functional areas regarding the IMb Tracing and ACS transaction workflow.

Wendy suggested we schedule the IMb Tracing & ACS program feedback as a topic for a future call.

Jody recirculated the subgroup work product/recommendation document and suggested workgroup members make the time to read it before the next workgroup call.

There were no new topics. Jody concluded the meeting early.